REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-16, and 20-24 as amended, are pending for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of allowable claim 19. As claim 19 depended directly from claim 1, this amendment is the equivalent of rewriting claim 19 in independent form. Claim 19 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 8, and 9 have been amended to replace "containing" with "comprising." Claims 2, 4-6, 12-16, and 21-24 have been amended to recite a recording layer instead of a DIP medium. Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to recite that the sub-layer including the substance generating free radicals also includes a non-fluorescent dye (*See* Examples 8-10 in the Specification), and also to recite that the free radicals decolorize the fluorescent dye, non-fluorescent dye, or both. Claim 10 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 7 (*See, e.g.*, Specification at page 10, lines 20-23). Claim 20 has been amended to reflect the changes made to claim 1. No new matter has been introduced by any of the amendments herein, such that entry of the claims is warranted at this time.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's recognition of the allowance of claim 7, and that claims 19 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims on page 8 of the Office Action. As noted above, claim 1 has been rewritten to include the features of claim 19.

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over JP 54-061541 to Tetsuo et al. ("Tetsuo") and JP 59-092448 to Sasaoka ("Sasaoka") for the reasons set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. The Office Action points to three examples on page 3 for the teaching of an organic solvent, a polymeric binder, 7.5 wt% of an oxidizing agent, and 1.5 wt% of a merocyanine dye coated to a thickness of 50 microns. Tetsuo teaches a heat-sensitive discoloring material that consists of (a) a film-forming binder, (b) merocyanine dye, and (c) an oxidizing agent (*See* Abstract). The Office Action maintains that the abstract of Sasaoka discloses that the Naphthol Green B in the lower layer is bleached by the action of benzoyl peroxide in the upper layer.

The Office Action points to notes in the margin of page 3 in response to Applicants' request for an English translation. The copy of Tetsuo supplied by the PTO includes notes on page 2, which relate to the oxidizing agents, but none on page 3. While Applicants dispute the disclosure of Tetsuo, to expedite prosecution, claims 8 and 9 have been amended to

recite that the sub-layer including the substance that generates free radicals also includes a non-fluorescent dye.

Tetsuo and Sasaoka, either individually or combined, do not teach or suggest the addition of a non-fluorescent dye to the sub-layer with the free-radical generating substance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn as no *prima facie* case of obviousness exists over the pending claims.

Claims 1, 4-6, 12, 14-16, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over EP 812698 to Katoh et al. ("Katoh"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,917,989 to Albert et al. ("Albert") and U.S. Patent No. 4,735,889 to Namba et al. ("Namba") for the reasons set forth on pages 3-5 of the Office Action.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of allowable claim 19. Claims 4-6, 12, 14-16, and 23 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 12-16, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tetsuo, in view of Albert and Namba for the reasons set forth on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12-16, and 23 is moot in light of the amendment made to claim 1. Claim 10 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 7. Therefore, the rejection of claim 10 is also moot. Accordingly, this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 12-16, and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tetsuo, in view of Albert, Namba, and U.S. Patent No. 5,665,522 to Vogel et al. ("Vogel"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,185,233 to Santo ("Santo") and JP 09-286979 to Inoue et al. ("Inoue") for the reasons set forth on pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action.

In view of Applicants' amendments to claims 1 and 10, this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, and 12-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tetsuo, in view of Albert and Namba, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,071,671 to Glusko et al. ("Glushko") and U.S. Patent No. 4,090,031 to Russell ("Russell") for the reasons set forth on pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action.

Again, due to the amendments made to the claims, this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Accordingly, the entire application is now in condition for allowance, early notice of which would be appreciated. Should the Examiner not agree with the Applicants' position, then a personal or telephonic interview is respectfully requested to discuss any remaining issues and expedite the eventual allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

3/9/06
Date

Evert F. Uy (Reg. No. 57,004)
For: Allan A. Fanucci (Reg. No. 30,256)

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
Customer No. 28765

(202) 282-5793